

government meeting that I have never seen a group of men less actuated by any other purpose than that of achieving peace. I emphasized that the NATO governments were prepared, in the realization of the awful realities which face us, to go as far as possible to bring about a climate and atmosphere which will ensure the laying of a foundation for international peace.

You will see from this, Mr. Chairman, that the question of disarmament looms very large in our minds and that we view with deep concern the unwillingness of the U.S.S.R. to participate further in the disarmament discussions which seemed to show some promise of success in the middle of last year. We welcome your advocacy of step-by-step progress but surely the first step is for the countries concerned to resume their discussions and to make use of the United Nations machinery created for the purpose.

One of your main proposals is that an obligation be adopted by the nations possessing nuclear weapons not to use these weapons and to cease the testing of nuclear weapons at a given date. We should point out that some time ago the U.S.S.R. did accept the principle, in the course of discussion in the Disarmament Sub-committee, that an obligation not to use nuclear weapons might be subject to the condition that they could be used for purposes of defence against aggression. This is a factor which certainly could be pursued further if disarmament talks were resumed. In general, we shall continue to advocate the proposals which we supported at the recent session of the UN Assembly. I would like, furthermore, to draw your attention to the flexible approach adopted in the NATO Communiqué that was designed to facilitate the reopening of discussions at an early date.

Rather than debate again the major issues on which our points of view diverge, I think it might be useful in this letter to concentrate on matters of particular concern or interest to Canada. Thus in reference to NATO policies, you refer to the existence of United States bases on Canadian soil. Canada has every right to take measures of self-defence and any actions it takes in this regard come within the provisions of the UN Charter. Our defence measures - whether taken alone or in concert with friendly countries - result from a conviction that such measures are necessary. Our readiness to bring about conditions in which the need for defence measures will be lessened was shown last summer when I gave assurance that in the context of a disarmament agreement the Canadian Government would be willing to open all or part of Canada to aerial and ground inspection on a basis of reciprocity. It seems to me that this is the type of proposal which should prove attractive to both our countries since we are neighbours across the Arctic. I have in mind in particular the kind of proposal Canada joined in sponsoring last August involving a system of inspection in the Arctic regions. We were willing then and are willing now to take such action in order to provide assurance against the fear of surprise attack.

Perhaps not unrelated to this is your assertion that attempts to alter the status quo by force would have catastrophic consequences. Without equivocation we assert that Canada rejects any attempt to impose territorial changes by force. It is not clear what comes within your definition of status quo, and this is something on which more information would be welcome. The Canadian Government continues to be concerned about the domination exercised by the U.S.S.R. over Eastern European